

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1 and 3-10 are pending, in which claim 6 is currently amended, and no claims canceled, withdrawn, or newly presented. No new matter is introduced.

The Office Action mailed April 4, 2005 objected to claim 6, provisionally rejected claims 1 and 3-6 under obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of *Norcott* (U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/435,703, hereinafter *Norcott* '703) and claims 1 and 3-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *Norcott* (U.S. 5,848, 405, hereinafter *Norcott* '405) in view of *Rauer et al.* (U.S. 6,161, 103).

Claim 6 has been amended to independent claim form as requested by the Office Action, and thus the objection to claim 6 should be withdrawn.

The provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1 and 3-6 over *Norcott* '703 is respectfully traversed because *Norcott* '703 does not disclose or suggest the features of the claims. Independent claim 1 recites "storing the change data from the recovery log in a database object other than the source object." Claim 1 of *Norcott* '703, in contrast, recites, "storing the change data extracted from the recovery log in a single pass into a plurality of database objects, said change data indicating modifications that has been performed to a plurality of source objects that correspond to the database objects."

Norcott '703, in ¶ 8, clearly states the differences of the subject matter, for example, of claim 1 as follows:

The present invention stems from the recognition that a major source of delay in asynchronous change capture occurs each time when data is extracted from the recovery log. In certain implementations, a separate Structured Query Language (SQL) statement is used to extract the change data in the recovery log for each individual change table, i.e. one SQL statement per change table, and there may be dozens of change tables since each change table corresponds to a source table on the OLTP system. Accordingly, the need for high performance among other needs is addressed by the present invention, by extracting the change data from the recovery log **in a single pass** over the disk but storing the extracted

change data in multiple tables. This approach reduces the time to process change data from a recovery log for 12 change tables from about 8 hours 11 minutes to just 45 minutes.

Thus, independent claim 1 of the present application does not satisfy the requirements of obviousness-type double patenting over independent claim 1 of *Norcott '703*. Furthermore, claim 3 of the present application recites, “renaming a source column into a change column,” while claim 3 of *Norcott '703* recites, “the modifications include a first update to a first column in a first source object among the source objects and a second update to a second column in a second source object among the source objects; and the first column and the second column have a same name.” The features recited by the two claims are clearly distinct and do not recite the same limitations, and there is no explanation by the Office Action of how these features satisfy the requirements of obviousness-type double patenting. A similar argument applies to claim 5 of the present application and claim 5 of *Norcott '703*, and thus the rejection should be withdrawn.

Further, the obviousness rejection of claims 1 and 3-10 over *Norcott '405* in view of *Rauer et al.* is respectfully traversed, as the references do not disclose or suggest the features of the claims. Independent claim 1 recites, “A method for change data capture, comprising the steps of: executing a database statement to extract, from a recovery log, change data indicating at least one modification that has been performed to a source object; and storing the change data from the recovery log in a database object other than the source object, wherein the database object includes a change table.” The Office Action (p. 5) correctly acknowledges that “*Norcott* does not explicitly indicate the claimed ‘statement to extract,’” and then contends, “*Rauer* discloses claimed staging system (the connector is a grouping mechanism for extraction statements and a specification for input and output data stores, see col. 19, lines 22-24, *Rauer*).” However, at col. 19: 21-27, *Rauer et al.* merely states:

The connector 406 defines a name and a description. The connector 406 is a grouping mechanism for extraction statements and a specification for input and output data stores. The description is used for documenting the connector. The name is the logical name of the connector. The connector 406 represents an ordered collection of connector steps 408.

This portion of *Rauer et al.* merely mentions “extraction statements” in a general sense, and none of the portions of *Rauer et al.* cited by the Office Action (e.g., col. 1: 46-47, col. 3: 19-20) suggest any type of “database statement to extract, from a recovery log, change data indicating at least one modification that has been performed to a source object” as recited by independent claim 1. Thus, the obviousness rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

The Office Action (pp. 9-12) applies the same portions of *Rauer et al.* in its rejections of independent claims 7 and 8. For reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1, the rejections of claims 7 and 8 should also be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 3-6 and 9-10, which depend from claims 1 and 7-8, respectively, are allowable for at least the same reasons as their independent claims, and are separately patentable on their own merits.

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the objections and rejections of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at 703-425-8501 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG & CARLSON, P.C.

July 5, 2005
Date

Margo Livesay
Margo Livesay, Ph.D.
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 41,946

10507 Braddock Rd
Suite A
Fairfax, VA 22032
Tel. 703-425-8501
Fax. 703-425-8518